

3 APRIL 1980

Bruce:

1. There are several points which were raised within your summary of the meeting with STAP which may need further examination. However, the STAP paper itself is so fraught with incorrect analysis, idealism, and inappropriate suggestions that we find it difficult to advocate anything that they have suggested. The paper should be rejected.

2. The issues raised in the paper which should be repudiated are:

a. Community - there is no requirement for SAFE to operate outside of the agency environment and imposing such a requirement would cause serious security problems associated with using the systems in this global context. There are now serious technical difficulties in trying to construct a system to support just the Agency analyst population. The problem gets worse in trying to make that same system support community users as well. There are many dangers in trying to take into account in one system diverse community requirements. The delays and increased risk of failure due to DIA involvement provides ample evidence of this.

b. Requirements - the STAP is incorrect in suggesting that the analyst environment should be continually studied to refine the requirements. This effort has been ongoing for more than four years and has been reasonably well accomplished. What is needed in the SAFE architecture is a fundamental system adaptability so that SAFE can accommodate the inevitable changes in the analyst environment as the system evolves.

c. Existing Solutions - we do not know of any of the comparable systems which the paper implies could be brought inhouse. There are many unique aspects to the SAFE requirements because of the large number of terminals which will eventually be supported, the secure environment, the massive size of the data base,

the availability requirements, and the expected user activity. Some individual aspects of SAFE may be available, but we are not aware of any system which comes remotely close to solving the real SAFE problems, including Interim SAFE.

d. Advisory Council - We disagree with the idea that imposing another high level and detached managerial panel will help SAFE. It should be made clear that if the issue is the way SAFE is being managed, then the solution is to change the managers, not add another level of management.

3. Notwithstanding all of the above, the STAP group has detected what are probably very real problems in the SAFE project, especially the Agency's relationship to the contractor. You may wish to take advantage of this current situation as an opportunity (possibly the last opportunity) to make some fundamental revisions in the SAFE project. For example, the original approach where the Agency performed the design and integration is, in our opinion, better than the current "turnkey" approach. Given the original approach we would be more capable of imposing on the contractor an architectural approach which has a lower risk and which is more compatible with our current environment. As a second example we could direct TRW to create a more evolutionary system, with less function available sooner. If you agree, these can be raised as counter proposals to the STAP suggestions.

At a minimum, the Agency, not TRW, should be in charge of the system.

4. In summary, we reject the STAP paper, but we urge you to take advantage of this opportunity to fundamentally revise the project to improve its chance of success.



STATINTL